

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,756	07/30/2003	Takayuki Hattori	2927-0152P	6804	
2292 75	590 03/14/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEW	VART KOLASCH & BII	SERGENT, RABON A			
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711		

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/629,756	HATTORI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Rabon Sergent	1711	

Belore the rining of an Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rabon Sergent	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
a) 🔲 The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		KST KEPLT WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three montherarned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be a since a notice of Appeal has been filed.	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
AMENDMENTS						
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NO		because			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) $igotimes$ They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(1.102.02.1).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:			•			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	h	I_4:£ AI:!!	4			
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•	• • •	•			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
		Rabon Sergent Primary Examiner	\mathcal{A}			
		, initially Examined				

Art Unit: 1711

Continuation of 3.: Applicants' proposed amendment sets forth a combination of limitations not previously claimed. Furthermore, the proposed amendment to claim 8 raises issues of new matter and indefiniteness.

Continuation of 5.: The rejections set forth within paragraphs 2-4 of the final Office action have been withdrawn in view of applicants' submission of the translations of the foreign test standards.

Continuation of 11.: The rejections set forth within paragraphs 1 and 5 of the final Office action have been maintained, because the arguments are based upon amendments that will not be entered. With respect to the rejection of claim 6, the position is maintained that no clear support exists to establish that mole percent was intended. With respect to claim 8, the proposed amendment is not supported by the cited passage within the specification; the cited passage pertains to the quantity of the recited alkylene oxide within a polyether polyol, as opposed to a weight percent of polypropylene glycol present. The prior art rejections have been maintained for the reasons set forh within the final Office action. Applicants' response completely ignores the examiner's response to applicants' previous arguments set forth within paragraph 11 of the final Office action.

RABON SERGENT